



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/869,610	03/13/2002	Yair Gaon	GAON=2	5793
1444	7590	10/04/2006	EXAMINER	
BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C. 624 NINTH STREET, NW SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20001-5303			VAN DOREN, BETH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3623	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/869,610	GAON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Beth Van Doren	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20020326,20020328</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a first office action on the merits. Claims 1-35 are pending.

Claim Objections

2. Claims 21-22, 25-26, and 31 are objected to because of the following informalities:

i. Claim 21 recites “wherein the plurality of current task assignment schedules is using a priority grade”, which should more appropriately be --wherein the plurality of current task assignment schedules are defined [is] using a priority grade--. Appropriate correction is required.

ii. Claim 22 recites steps (a), (b), (d), (e), (f) and then recites steps (b), (c), (d), (e).

Therefore, some steps use the same labels twice and step (c) is omitted. Appropriate correction is required. The steps are construed as steps (a)-(i), respectively.

iii. Claim 25 recites “vition” instead of --visitation--. Appropriate correction is required.

iv. Claim 26 recites “selects worker for task assignment scheduling” instead of --selects a worker for task assignment scheduling--. Appropriate correction is required.

V. Claim 31 recites “the client in substantially restricted” which should more appropriately be --the client is substantially restricted--. Correction is required.

3. Claim 22 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim, or amend the claim to place the claim in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim in independent form. Claim 22 is an improper dependent claim because it fails the infringement

Art Unit: 3623

test, since it is conceivable that claim 22 can be infringed without infringing the base method claim. First, claim 22 is an apparatus/product claim with the interconnected modules of a client, a worker, and a server application, where these modules are not actively performing steps (a)-(i) (steps (a)-(i) addressed above). Further, even if the apparatus specifically performs steps (a)-(i), claim 22 does not recite a step for searching for a qualified worker located in the vicinity of the customer and further includes a step for modifying the current task assignment schedule. Therefore, since claim 22 does not include every limitation of the claim from which it depends and further since claim 22 does not actively recite the steps occurring in claim 1 (and therefore recites the general structure and/or software of an apparatus), claim 22 would conceivably be infringed by something that would not also infringe the basic claim.

4. Claims 33-35 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. First, claims 33-35 all fail to further limit claim 22, since claim 22 contains a client application, a server application, and a worker application, respectively, and claims 33-35 do not add any further limitations that serve to limit what is already recited in claim 22.

Further, in each instance, claims 33-35 fail the infringement test, since it is conceivable that each of claims 33-35 can be infringed without infringing claim 22. With regards to claim 33, claim 33 recites a client application module, and therefore does not specifically recite any steps or components nor does it recite a server or worker application, as set forth in claim 22. With regards to claim 34, claim 34 recites a server application module, and therefore does not

Art Unit: 3623

specifically recite any steps or components nor does it recite a client or worker application, as set forth in claim 22. Finally, with regards to claim 35, claim 35 recites a worker application module, and therefore does not specifically recite any steps or components nor does it recite a server or client application, as set forth in claim 22.

Therefore, since claims 33-35 do not include, in each instance, every limitation of the claim from which it depends, claims 33-35 would each conceivably be infringed by something that would not also infringe the basic claim.

5. Claims 23-24, 27-30, and 32 depend from claim 22, and are therefore also objected to using the same rationale set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claims 5, 14, and 22-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 5 and 14 recite “using relational database-like rules” to perform defining a schedule and selecting and reporting, respectively. It is unclear as to what is the scope of “database-like” or how rules that are relational database-like would effect defining and selecting without the specific use of a relational database, relational tables, etc. Clarification is required. For examination purposes, Examiner has construed “using relational database-like rules” to mean that defined data is selected based on specified attributes.

Art Unit: 3623

Claim 22 recites a system comprising a client application module, a server application module, and a worker application module. Since modules are merely software per se and since there are no hardware elements specifically recited that would provide the structure necessary of a system, it is unclear as to how a grouping of software elements is a system, as claimed.

Clarification is required.

Further, claim 22 recites both a client application module and a server application module. However, both of these modules contain the same limitations of “defining a current task assignment schedule to a worker”, “correlating the monitored location with the current schedule”, and “selecting and reporting aspects of the correlation”. It is unclear as to what is specifically performed at the client application module and what is specifically performed at the server application module, since both appear to contain some of the same elements. Clarification is required. For examination purposes, examiner has assumed that the server application module aids the client application module in performing these tasks.

Claims 23-30 depend from claim 22, and are therefore also objected to using the same rationale set forth above.

Claim 31 recites “the processor of the client is substantially restricted to simple input and output transactions”. The scope of this claim is vague and indefinite because it is not specifically clear what is included in the terms “substantially” and “simple”. Clarification is required.

Claim 32 recites “substantially current download”. The scope of this claim is vague and indefinite because it is not specifically clear what is included in the term “substantially”. Clarification is required.

Claims 33-35 recite “a client application module”, “a server application module”, and “a worker application module”, respectively. As discussed above with regards to claim 22, since modules are merely software per se and since there are no hardware elements specifically recited in claim 33 (dependent on claims 22), in claim 34 (dependent on claims 22), or in claim 35 (dependent on claims 22), that would provide the structure necessary of a system, it is unclear as to how a grouping of software elements is specifically a system, as claimed. Further, it is unclear what specifically claims 33-35 do or what specifically is included claims 33-35, since the elements contained are already recited in claim 22. Clarification is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

9. Claims 1, 5-16, 20-28, 30-31, and 33-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by MDSI Advantex (www.mdsi-advantex.com).

As per claim 1, MDSI Advantex teaches a method to facilitating the ability of a service organization engaging mobile workers to find a worker qualified to carry out tasks to be carried out in behalf of a customer of the organization and for then managing the selected mobile worker to increase his productivity the method comprising the steps of:

(a) searching for a qualified worker located in the vicinity of the customer (See page 3, sections 1-2, page 4, page 5, sections 2-3, wherein a qualified worker is searched for by the dispatcher/dispatching system);

Art Unit: 3623

- (b) defining a current task assignment schedule to a worker (See page 4, section 3, page 6, section 2-3, wherein tasks are assigned to a worker and these schedules are sent to the worker);
- (c) communicating the current schedule to the worker (See page 3, section 2, page 4, sections 1 and 3, page 5, section 1-2, page 6, sections 2-3, wherein the schedule is communicated to the worker via the mobile device);
- (d) monitoring automatically the worker's location during the current schedule (See page 5, sections 2-3, wherein the worker's location is monitored);
- (e) correlating the monitored location with the current schedule (See page 5, sections 2-3, wherein the system allows the status of orders and field service representatives to be visualized and wherein the dispatcher can schedule and analyze based on this data);
- (f) selecting and reporting aspects of the correlation (See page 5, sections 2-4, and page 6, section 1, wherein aspects of the association of location and jobs are shown).

As per claim 5, MDSI Advantex teaches the defining is using relational database-like rules (See page 4, section 3, page 6, section 2-3, wherein the schedule is selected based on constrained data concerning the worker).

As per claim 6, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein the communication is email, facsimile, cellular telephone voice channel, cellular telephone signal channel (SMS), internet, VOIP telephony, IDEN-type digital radio, or by posting to a worker accessible media (See page 3, sections 1-2, page 5, sections 1 and 3; page 6, sections 2-3, page 19, section 1, page 20, sections 1 and 2, and page 21).

As per claim 7, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein the communicating is in digital form (See page 3, sections 1-2, page 5, sections 1 and 3, page 6, sections 2-3, page 19, section 1, page 20, sections 1 and 2, and page 21).

As per claim 8, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein the communicating includes transmission of voice, data, facsimile, graphics, map, codes, a compressed representation of any of the aforesaid, any combination of the aforesaid, or a content redundant combination of at least two of the aforesaid (See page 3, sections 1-2, page 5, sections 1 and 3, page 6, sections 2-3, page 19, section 1, page 20, sections 1 and 2, and page 21).

As per claim 9, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein the monitoring is by cellular telephone cell based locating of the worker and the worker maintains a proximate cellular telephone, by querying the worker and recording the worker's location response, or by GPS locating of the worker and the worker maintains a proximate GPS monitor (See page 5, section 3, wherein the worker is monitored using GPS).

As per claim 10, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein locating includes triangulation or cell intersection (See page 5, section 3, wherein the worker is monitored using GPS, and wherein GPS works through the triangulation of position).

As per claim 11, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein the monitoring is done periodically, according to anticipated location changes indicated in the current task assignment schedule, randomly, or upon management query (See page 5, sections 2-3).

As per claim 12, MDSI Advantex discloses wherein the monitoring is done at each occurrence of the worker reporting or transacting with management, or upon the turning on a worker's communications unit, or upon each occurrence of a worker's communications unit

Art Unit: 3623

entering a new communications cell (See page 5, sections 2-3, wherein the worker is monitored in real time and thus when the GPS unit is on to communicate and in a service area, it will communicate the monitored location)

As per claim 13, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein the correlating discovers location violations from the current task assignment schedule, measures accuracy of the current task assignment schedule, or measures the worker's productivity against a current standard of productivity for each assigned task (See page 5 and page 6, section 1, wherein the correlating discovers, analyzes, and monitors progress/status and wherein productivity data and metrics are reported).

As per claim 14, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein the selecting is using relational database-like rules (See page 5, sections 2-4, and page 6, section 1, wherein aspects of the association of location and jobs are shown).

As per claim 15, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein the reporting is by email, facsimile, cellular telephone voice channel, cellular telephone signal channel (SMS), internet, VOW telephony, IDEN-type digital radio, or by posting to a worker accessible media (See page 5, sections 2-4, and page 6, section 1, wherein the reporting is done via the network and thus via worker accessible media).

As per claim 16, MDSI Advantex discloses wherein the defining of a current task assignment schedule is optimized for minimum travel (See page 4, sections 2-3, page 5, section 2, page 13, section 1, wherein travel time and distance is minimized).

As per claim 20, MDSI Advantex discloses wherein correlating is represented on a map (See page 5, sections 2-3).

As per claim 21, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein the plurality of current task assignment schedules are defined using a priority grade for the task assignments and a worker qualification grade for each worker (See page 4, sections 2-3, which disclose order completion time and required skills).

As per claim 22, claim 22 recites equivalent limitations to claims 1 and 2 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above. MDSI Advantex further discloses at least on client application module, at least one server application module, and at least one worker application module, wherein each module is associated with a communication unit and wherein there is a predefined transaction format between any pair of modules (See page 5, section 1, page 6, section 3, page 19-22, which disclose a client application, a server, and a worker application module implemented over the network with hosts, processors, and technicians with remote devices).

As per claims 23 and 24, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein transactions between the modules include a common Geographical Information System (GIS) location description for the worker and his task assignment and wherein location descriptions for the worker and his task assignment are represented graphically on at least one map (See page 5, sections 2-3, which discloses a computer-based tool for analyzing and mapping things that exist and events that happen on Earth, wherein worker information and tasks are displayed on a MAP program).

As per claim 25, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein fulfilling of a customer request for visitation by a task qualified mobile worker includes: the client application recording the visitation location by using customer query response or by using a query response of an accessible database; the client application searching for at least one qualified mobile worker who

Art Unit: 3623

is presently near the visitation location; and the search is conducted using a last known location for workers accessible from the server application (See page 3, sections 1-2, page 4, sections 1-3, page 5, sections 2-3, wherein the client application records the location or an order/job request, a worker is searched for to perform a job who is near the location, and wherein the system displays the last updated location of the worker).

As per claim 26, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein the client application selects a worker for task assignment scheduling to the visitation location (See page 3, sections 1-2, page 4, page 5, sections 2-3, wherein a qualified worker is selected by the dispatcher/dispatching system)

As per claim 27, MDSI Advantex wherein the client application conveys worker-customer communication information to either the worker or the customer (See page 3, sections 1-2, page 4, section 1, page 5, section 3, wherein information is conveyed to the worker concerning the customer).

As per claim 28, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein the client application negotiates, with the worker or with the customer, adding of the visitation to the workers task assignment schedule (See page 4, sections 2-3, wherein the customer negotiates with the dispatcher, using the system, an appointment time).

As per claim 30, MDSI Advantex teaches wherein the client application module, one portion located at a processor of a client and the other portion at a server of a network, and a predetermined transaction protocol binding the two portions (See page 1, sections 1-2, page 3, sections 1-2, page 4, page 5, sections 1-2, page 6, section 2-3, wherein the system has a host and client applications. Examiner notes that this claim recites a client, wherein MDSI Advantex discloses both the clients of the worker and the dispatcher terminals. When an application is run

in a network environment with a host and clients, the heart of the application is on the server, with parts of the application distributed over the network. See also page 8, section 1, page 16, section 1, and pages 18-20).

As per claim 31, MDSI Advantex discloses wherein the portion located at the processor of the client is substantially restricted to simple input and output transactions (See page 3, sections 1-2, page 4, page 5, sections 1-2, page 6, section 2-3, wherein the user of the applications are limited to specific functions with determined outputs, such as the dispatcher searching for availability to assign a job and receiving such information. See also pages 18-20).

As per claim 33-35, MDSI Advantex discloses a client application module, a server application module, and a worker application module (See page 5, section 1, page 6, section 3, page 20-22, which disclose a client application, a server, and a worker application module implemented over the network with hosts, processors, and technicians with remote devices).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 2-4 and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MDSI Advantex (www.mdsi-advantex.com) in view of Lesaint et al. (U.S. 6,578,005).

As per claims 2-3, MDSI Advantex discloses rebalancing and redistributing tasks of the work schedule (See page 4, section 3). However, MDSI Advantex does not expressly disclose

Art Unit: 3623

that the current task assignment schedule modification is communicated to the worker and that the modification is effected automatically.

Lesaint et al. discloses the current task assignment schedule modification is communicated to the worker, the modification is effected automatically, and the (See column 3, lines 1-15 and 35-45, column 5, lines 50-52, column 8, lines 5-17, column 9, lines 30-40, column 10, lines 25-40, column 11, lines 19-29, wherein the current task assignment schedule, with modifications, is communicated to the worker when the worker reports in to the system).

Both Lesaint et al. and MDSI Advantex disclose redistributing tasks and communicating schedules with field technicians. MDSI Advantex discloses rebalancing and redistributing tasks of the work schedule, sending messages to workers in the system, and automatically generating dispatch orders. Lesaint et al. specifically discloses modifying the schedule automatically when updates occur and communicating current schedules to the remote workers. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to communicate a modification to the worker, the modification generated automatically, in order to increase the speed and efficiency of communicating jobs and updates to the worker. See page 1, section 1, page 3, section 1-2, of MDSI Advantex.

As per claim 4, MDSI Advantex discloses rebalancing and redistributing (i.e. modifying) tasks of the work schedule (See page 4, section 3). However, neither MDSI Advantex nor Lesaint et al. expressly disclose negotiating a redistribution with a worker.

Both Lesaint et al. and MDSI Advantex disclose redistributing tasks and communicating schedules with field technicians. MDSI Advantex discloses rebalancing and redistributing tasks of the work schedule, sending messages to workers in the system, and automatically generating

Art Unit: 3623

dispatch orders. Lesaint et al. specifically discloses modifying the schedule automatically when updates occur and communicating current schedules to the remote workers. It is old and well known in the service industry to negotiate the acceptance of a modified schedule with a worker in order to increase employee satisfaction. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to negotiate the modification with the mobile technicians of MDSI Advantex and Lesaint et al. in order to increase employee satisfaction by communicating with the employee concerning changes to their job as well as ensure that the employee will be able to complete the task (without having to overextend him/herself).

As per claims 17-18, MDSI Advantex discloses rebalancing and redistributing tasks (i.e. modifying) a work schedule (See page 4, section 3), a priority associated with tasks, and creating a schedule based on travel time (See page 4, sections 2-3, page 5, section 2, page 13, section 1, wherein travel time and distance is minimized. See page 3, section 2, page 4, section 1-3, which discloses priority (emergencies, type of request, etc.)). However, MDSI Advantex does not expressly disclose the modified current task assignment schedule is optimized for minimal travel.

Lesaint et al. discloses rescheduling tasks and modifying current task schedules when a worker's geographic position is more desirable and the modification minimizes travel time (See column 5, lines 10-35, column 7, line 45-column 8, line 17, column 25, lines 20-40, wherein tasks are rescheduled based on geographic positions).

Both Lesaint et al. and MDSI Advantex disclose redistributing tasks and communicating schedules with field technicians. MDSI Advantex discloses rebalancing and redistributing tasks of the work schedule as well as scheduling using the attribute of travel time. Lesaint et al. discloses modifying current task schedules when a worker's geographic position is more

Art Unit: 3623

desirable. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to optimize a modified schedule in order to minimize travel in order to increase customer service by more dynamically changing to changes, which occur and affect the schedule.

As per claim 19, MDSI Advantex discloses rebalancing and redistributing tasks (i.e. modifying) a work schedule (See page 4, section 3), wherein the tasks are communicated to the worker using email, facsimile, a cellular phone voice channel, a cellular telephone signal channel (SMS), internet, VOIP telephony, IDEN-type digital radio, or by posting to a worker accessible media (See page 3, sections 1-2, page 5, sections 1 and 3, page 6, sections 2-3, page 19, section 1, page 20, sections 1 and 2, and page 21).

12. Claims 29 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over MDSI Advantex (www.mdsi-advantex.com)

As per claim 29, MDSI Advantex discloses a remote technician having an application remote from the host as well as a client application and automatic rule based monitoring and reporting instruction logic (See page 4, sections 1-3, page 5, section 1-4, page 6, sections 1-3, and pages 18-22, which discloses hosts and clients, monitoring the technicians and reporting information). However, MDSI Advantex does not expressly disclose that the client application opens a virtual session at the server application.

MDSI Advantex discloses a wireless application used by the remote work force to access corporate wire line networks. It is old and well known in remote computing for client applications to open virtual sessions at the server application so that each owner can use and

Art Unit: 3623

administer as though they had complete control of the server, without having to manage the hardware aspects of running a server, thus increasing the efficiency and ease of use of the remote application. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a virtual session at the server application in MDSI Advantex, at either the remote technicians or dispatchers applications, in order to allow the users to more efficiently connect to and use the applications of the enterprise, such as by allowing the field personnel to take their office on the road. See page 18-19 of MDSI Advantex.

As per claim 32, MDSI Advantex does not expressly disclose that the portion located at the processor of the client maintains a substantially current download of data from the server application. Examiner takes official notice that it is old and well known for software and other updates resident at the server to be pushed to client applications in order to increase the efficiency of the system by ensuring that all clients are working with the same applications/software/etc. Further, it is old and well known for the server to synchronize data across the system to increase the accuracy of the data used at remote applications. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to maintain a substantially current download of data at the client in order to increase the accuracy of information known to the client devices, thus allowing the service to excel by operating off of accurate and current information. See page 1, section 1, page 3, sections 1-2, of MDSI Advantex.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 3623

Smith et al. (U.S. 5,835,376) teaches a technician/vehicle dispatch and monitoring system with an AVL system.

Harrison et al. (U.S. 6,990,458) teaches the field of technician dispatch and monitoring remote technicians.

Harrison (U.S. 2003/0069797) teaches using GPS to track the location of a mobile worker, and assigning a worker to an appointment based on skills.

Kida (U.S. 5,907,829) teaches scheduling between a requester and a requestee, which includes negotiations.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Beth Van Doren whose telephone number is (571) 272-6737. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

bvd

bvd

September 26, 2006

Beth Van Doren
Beth Van Doren
patent examiner
AU 3623